

# Foundation of Cryptography (0368-4162-01), Lecture 4

## Pseudorandom Functions

Iftach Haitner, Tel Aviv University

November 29, 2011

## Section 1

# Function Families

## function families

- 1  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\mathbb{F}_n = \{f: \{0, 1\}^{m(n)} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}$
- 2 We write  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^{m(n)} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)}\}$
- 3 If  $m(n) = \ell(n) = n$ , we omit it from the notation
- 4 We identify function with their description
- 5 The rv  $F_n$  is uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_n$

## efficient function families

### Definition 1 (efficient function family)

An ensemble of function families  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is efficient, if the following hold:

**Samplable.**  $\mathcal{F}$  is samplable in polynomial-time: there exists a PPT that given  $1^n$ , outputs (the description of) a uniform element in  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .

**Efficient.** There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that given  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and (a description of)  $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ , outputs  $f(x)$ .

## random functions

### Definition 2 (random functions)

For  $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$  consist of all functions from  $\{0, 1\}^m$  to  $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ .

## random functions

### Definition 2 (random functions)

For  $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$  consist of all functions from  $\{0, 1\}^m$  to  $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ .

- It takes  $(2^\ell)^{2^m}$  bits to describe an element inside  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$ .

## random functions

### Definition 2 (random functions)

For  $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$  consist of all functions from  $\{0, 1\}^m$  to  $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ .

- It takes  $(2^\ell)^{2^m}$  bits to describe an element inside  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$ .
- We sometimes think of  $\pi \in \Pi_{m,\ell}$  as a random string of length  $2^m \cdot \ell$ .

## random functions

### Definition 2 (random functions)

For  $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$  consist of all functions from  $\{0, 1\}^m$  to  $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ .

- It takes  $(2^\ell)^{2^m}$  bits to describe an element inside  $\Pi_{m,\ell}$ .
- We sometimes think of  $\pi \in \Pi_{m,\ell}$  as a random string of length  $2^m \cdot \ell$ .
- $\Pi_n = \Pi_{n,n}$



## pseudorandom functions

### Definition 3 (pseudorandom functions)

A function family ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}\}$  is pseudorandom, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_{n,m(n)}}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n),$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$ .

## pseudorandom functions

### Definition 3 (pseudorandom functions)

A function family ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}\}$  is pseudorandom, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_{n,m(n)}}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n),$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$ .

- 1 Suffices to consider  $m(n) = n$

# pseudorandom functions

## Definition 3 (pseudorandom functions)

A function family ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}\}$  is pseudorandom, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_{n,m(n)}}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n),$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$ .

- 1 Suffices to consider  $m(n) = n$
- 2 Easy to construct (with no assumption) for  $\Pi^{m,\ell}$  with  $m \in O(\log n)$  and  $\ell \in \text{poly}(n)$

# pseudorandom functions

## Definition 3 (pseudorandom functions)

A function family ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}\}$  is pseudorandom, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_{n,m(n)}}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n),$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$ .

- 1 Suffices to consider  $m(n) = n$
- 2 Easy to construct (with no assumption) for  $\Pi^{m,\ell}$  with  $m \in O(\log n)$  and  $\ell \in \text{poly}(n)$
- 3 PRF easily imply a PRG

# pseudorandom functions

## Definition 3 (pseudorandom functions)

A function family ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}\}$  is pseudorandom, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_{n,m(n)}}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n),$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$ .

- ① Suffices to consider  $m(n) = n$
- ② Easy to construct (with no assumption) for  $\Pi^{m,\ell}$  with  $m \in O(\log n)$  and  $\ell \in \text{poly}(n)$
- ③ PRF easily imply a PRG
- ④ Pseudorandom permutations (PRPs)

## Section 2

# PRF from OWF

## the construction

### Construction 4

Let  $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . Let  $g_0(s) = g(s)_{1,\dots,n}$  and  $g_1(s) = g(s)_{n+1,\dots,2n}$ . For  $s$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , let  $f_s$  be defined as

$$f_s(x) = g_{x_n}(\dots(g_{x_2}(g_{x_1}(s))))$$

# the construction

## Construction 4

Let  $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . Let  $g_0(s) = g(s)_{1,\dots,n}$  and  $g_1(s) = g(s)_{n+1,\dots,2n}$ . For  $s$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , let  $f_s$  be defined as

$$f_s(x) = g_{x_n}(\dots(g_{x_2}(g_{x_1}(s))))$$

Let  $\mathbb{F}_n = \{f_s: s \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$  and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n\}$ .



# the construction

## Construction 4

Let  $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . Let  $g_0(s) = g(s)_{1,\dots,n}$  and  $g_1(s) = g(s)_{n+1,\dots,2n}$ . For  $s$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , let  $f_s$  be defined as

$$f_s(x) = g_{x_n}(\dots(g_{x_2}(g_{x_1}(s))))$$

Let  $\mathbb{F}_n = \{f_s: s \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$  and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n\}$ .

$g$  is efficient function implies that  $\mathbb{F}$  is an efficient family.

## the construction

### Construction 4

Let  $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . Let  $g_0(s) = g(s)_{1,\dots,n}$  and  $g_1(s) = g(s)_{n+1,\dots,2n}$ . For  $s$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , let  $f_s$  be defined as

$$f_s(x) = g_{x_n}(\dots(g_{x_2}(g_{x_1}(s))))$$

Let  $\mathbb{F}_n = \{f_s: s \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$  and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n\}$ .

$g$  is efficient function implies that  $\mathbb{F}$  is an efficient family.

### Theorem 5 (Goldreich-Goldwasser-Micali)

*If  $g$  is a PRG then  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF.*

## the construction

### Construction 4

Let  $g: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ . Let  $g_0(s) = g(s)_{1,\dots,n}$  and  $g_1(s) = g(s)_{n+1,\dots,2n}$ . For  $s$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , let  $f_s$  be defined as

$$f_s(x) = g_{x_n}(\dots(g_{x_2}(g_{x_1}(s))))$$

Let  $\mathbb{F}_n = \{f_s: s \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$  and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n\}$ .

$g$  is efficient function implies that  $\mathbb{F}$  is an efficient family.

### Theorem 5 (Goldreich-Goldwasser-Micali)

*If  $g$  is a PRG then  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF.*

### Corollary 6

*OWFs imply PRFs.*

## Proof Idea

- For a fixed  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , consider the execution tree  $T_s$

## Proof Idea

- For a fixed  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , consider the execution tree  $T_s$
- Observation:  $D = (g(g_0(U_n)), g(g_1(U_n)))$  is pseudorandom:

## Proof Idea

- For a fixed  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , consider the execution tree  $T_s$
- Observation:  $D = (g(g_0(U_n)), g(g_1(U_n)))$  is pseudorandom:

Proof:  $D' = (g(U_n^{(0)}), g(U_n^1)) \approx_c U_{4n}$  and  $D \approx_c D'$ .

## Proof Idea

- For a fixed  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , consider the execution tree  $T_s$
- Observation:  $D = (g(g_0(U_n)), g(g_1(U_n)))$  is pseudorandom:  
Proof:  $D' = (g(U_n^{(0)}), g(U_n^{(1)})) \approx_c U_{4n}$  and  $D \approx_c D'$ .
- Hence we can handle input of length 1
- Extend to longer inputs?

# Proof Idea

- For a fixed  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , consider the execution tree  $T_s$
- Observation:  $D = (g(g_0(U_n)), g(g_1(U_n)))$  is pseudorandom:  
Proof:  $D' = (g(U_n^{(0)}), g(U_n^{(1)})) \approx_c U_{4n}$  and  $D \approx_c D'$ .
- Hence we can handle input of length 1
- Extend to longer inputs?
- We show that an efficient sample from the *truth table* of  $f \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_n$ , is computationally indistinguishable from that of  $\pi \leftarrow \Pi_{n,n}$ .



## Actual proof

Assume  $\exists$  PPT  $D$ ,  $p \in \text{poly}$  and infinite set  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  with

$$\left| \Pr[D^{F_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_n}(1^n) = 1] \right| \geq \frac{1}{p(n)}, \quad (1)$$

for any  $n \in \mathcal{I}$  and fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

## Actual proof

Assume  $\exists$  PPT  $D$ ,  $p \in \text{poly}$  and infinite set  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  with

$$\left| \Pr[D^{F_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\Pi_n}(1^n) = 1] \right| \geq \frac{1}{p(n)}, \quad (1)$$

for any  $n \in \mathcal{I}$  and fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

Let  $t = t(n) \in \text{poly}$  be a bound on the running time of  $D(1^n)$ .

We use  $D$  to construct a PPT  $D'$  such that

$$\left| \Pr[D'(U_{2n}^t) = 1] - \Pr[D'(g(U_n)^t) = 1] \right| > \delta(n)/n,$$

where  $U_{2n}^t = U_{2n}^{(1)}, \dots, U_{2n}^{(t(n))}$  and  
 $g(U_n)^t = g(U_n^{(1)}), \dots, g(U_n^{(t(n))})$ .

## The hybrid

Let  $g$  and  $f$  be as in the definition of  $\mathbb{F}_n$

### Definition 7

For  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n: \pi \in \Pi_{k,n}\}$ , where  $h_\pi(x) = f_{\pi(x_1, \dots, k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

## The hybrid

Let  $g$  and  $f$  be as in the definition of  $\mathbb{F}_n$

### Definition 7

For  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n: \pi \in \Pi_{k,n}\}$ , where  $h_\pi(x) = f_{\pi(x_1, \dots, k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

- $f_y(\lambda) = y$
- $\Pi_{0,n} = \{0, 1\}^n$ , and for  $\pi \in \Pi_{0,n}$  let  $\pi(\lambda) = \pi$

## The hybrid

Let  $g$  and  $f$  be as in the definition of  $\mathbb{F}_n$

### Definition 7

For  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n: \pi \in \Pi_{k,n}\}$ , where  $h_\pi(x) = f_{\pi(x_1, \dots, k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

- $f_y(\lambda) = y$
- $\Pi_{0,n} = \{0, 1\}^n$ , and for  $\pi \in \Pi_{0,n}$  let  $\pi(\lambda) = \pi$
- Note that  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $\mathcal{H}_n = \Pi_{n,n}$

## The hybrid

Let  $g$  and  $f$  be as in the definition of  $\mathbb{F}_n$

### Definition 7

For  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n: \pi \in \Pi_{k,n}\}$ , where  $h_\pi(x) = f_{\pi(x_1, \dots, k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

- $f_y(\lambda) = y$
- $\Pi_{0,n} = \{0, 1\}^n$ , and for  $\pi \in \Pi_{0,n}$  let  $\pi(\lambda) = \pi$
- Note that  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $\mathcal{H}_n = \Pi_{n,n}$
- Can we emulate  $\mathcal{H}_k$ ?

## The hybrid

Let  $g$  and  $f$  be as in the definition of  $\mathbb{F}_n$

### Definition 7

For  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n: \pi \in \Pi_{k,n}\}$ , where  $h_\pi(x) = f_{\pi(x_1, \dots, k)}(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

- $f_y(\lambda) = y$
  - $\Pi_{0,n} = \{0, 1\}^n$ , and for  $\pi \in \Pi_{0,n}$  let  $\pi(\lambda) = \pi$
  - Note that  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $\mathcal{H}_n = \Pi_{n,n}$
  - Can we emulate  $\mathcal{H}_k$ ? We emulate if from D's point of view.
  - We present efficient "function family"  $\{\mathcal{O}_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ , such that
    - $D^{\mathcal{O}_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$
    - $D^{\mathcal{O}_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n)$
- for any  $k \in [n]$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_k$  and  $H_k$  are uniformly sampled from  $\mathcal{O}_k$  and  $\mathcal{H}_k$  respectively.

## completing the proof

Let  $D'(y)$  return  $D^{O_k(y)}$  for  $k$  uniformly chosen in  $[n]$ .



## completing the proof

Let  $D'(y)$  return  $D^{O_k(y)}$  for  $k$  uniformly chosen in  $[n]$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Pr[D'(U_{2n}^t) = 1] - \Pr[D'(g(U_n)^t) = 1] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) = 1] - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) = 1] \right| \end{aligned}$$

## completing the proof

Let  $D'(y)$  return  $D^{O_k(y)}$  for  $k$  uniformly chosen in  $[n]$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Pr[D'(U_{2n}^t) = 1] - \Pr[D'(g(U_n)^t) = 1] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) = 1] - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) = 1] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr[D^{H_k}(1^n) = 1] - \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr[D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n) = 1] \right| \end{aligned}$$

## completing the proof

Let  $D'(y)$  return  $D^{O_k(y)}$  for  $k$  uniformly chosen in  $[n]$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Pr[D'(U_{2n}^t) = 1] - \Pr[D'(g(U_n)^t) = 1] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) = 1] - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Pr[D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) = 1] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr[D^{H_k}(1^n) = 1] - \sum_{k=1}^n \Pr[D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n) = 1] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \Pr[D^{H_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{H_0}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \frac{1}{np(n)} \square \end{aligned}$$

Actual proof

## The family $\mathcal{O}_k$

$$\mathcal{O}_k := \{O_{s^1, \dots, s^t} : s^1, \dots, s^t \in \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n\}.$$

### Algorithm 8 ( $O_{s^1, \dots, s^t}$ )

On the  $i$ 'th query  $x^i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ :

- ➊ If  $x^\ell$  with  $x_{1, \dots, k-1}^\ell = x_{1, \dots, k-1}^i$  was previously asked, set  $z = s_{x_k}^\ell$  (where  $\ell$  is the minimal such index). Otherwise, set  $z = s_{x_k}^i$ .
- ➋ Return  $f_z(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

Actual proof

## The family $\mathcal{O}_k$

$$\mathcal{O}_k := \{O_{s^1, \dots, s^t} : s^1, \dots, s^t \in \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n\}.$$

### Algorithm 8 ( $O_{s^1, \dots, s^t}$ )

On the  $i$ 'th query  $x^i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ :

- 1 If  $x^\ell$  with  $x_{1, \dots, k-1}^\ell = x_{1, \dots, k-1}^i$  was previously asked, set  $z = s_{x_k}^\ell$  (where  $\ell$  is the minimal such index). Otherwise, set  $z = s_{x_k}^i$ .
- 2 Return  $f_z(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

The “oracle” is *stateful*.

## The family $\mathcal{O}_k$

$$\mathcal{O}_k := \{O_{s^1, \dots, s^t} : s^1, \dots, s^t \in \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n\}.$$

### Algorithm 8 ( $O_{s^1, \dots, s^t}$ )

On the  $i$ 'th query  $x^i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ :

- ① If  $x^\ell$  with  $x_{1, \dots, k-1}^\ell = x_{1, \dots, k-1}^i$  was previously asked, set  $z = s_{x_k}^\ell$  (where  $\ell$  is the minimal such index). Otherwise, set  $z = s_{x_k}^i$ .
- ② Return  $f_z(x_{k+1}, \dots, n)$

The “oracle” is *stateful*.

We need to prove that  $D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$  and  $D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n)$ .

Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$$

## Proposition 9

For any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any algorithm  $A$ , it holds that  $A^{\Pi_{\ell,m}} \equiv A^{B_{\ell,m}}$ , where the stateful random algorithm  $B_{\ell,m}$  answers identical queries with the same answer, and answers new queries with a random string of length  $m$ .

Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$$

## Proposition 9

For any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any algorithm  $A$ , it holds that  $A^{\Pi_{\ell,m}} \equiv A^{B_{\ell,m}}$ , where the stateful random algorithm  $B_{\ell,m}$  answers identical queries with the same answer, and answers new queries with a random string of length  $m$ .

Proof?



Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$$

## Proposition 9

For any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any algorithm  $A$ , it holds that  $A^{\Pi_{\ell,m}} \equiv A^{B_{\ell,m}}$ , where the stateful random algorithm  $B_{\ell,m}$  answers identical queries with the same answer, and answers new queries with a random string of length  $m$ .

Proof? Does the above trivialize the whole issue of PRF?

Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$$

## Proposition 9

For any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any algorithm  $A$ , it holds that  $A^{\Pi_{\ell,m}} \equiv A^{B_{\ell,m}}$ , where the stateful random algorithm  $B_{\ell,m}$  answers identical queries with the same answer, and answers new queries with a random string of length  $m$ .

Proof? Does the above trivialize the whole issue of PRF? Let  $\tilde{O}_k$  be the variant that returns  $z$  (and not  $f_{x_{k+1}, \dots, n}(z)$ ) and let  $\tilde{D}_k$  be the algorithm that implements  $D$  using  $\tilde{O}_k$  (by computing  $f_{x_{k+1}, \dots, n}(z)$  by itself).

Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n)$$

## Proposition 9

For any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any algorithm  $A$ , it holds that  $A^{\Pi_{\ell,m}} \equiv A^{B_{\ell,m}}$ , where the stateful random algorithm  $B_{\ell,m}$  answers identical queries with the same answer, and answers new queries with a random string of length  $m$ .

Proof? Does the above trivialize the whole issue of PRF? Let  $\tilde{O}_k$  be the variant that returns  $z$  (and not  $f_{x_{k+1}, \dots, n}(z)$ ) and let  $\tilde{D}_k$  be the algorithm that implements  $D$  using  $\tilde{O}_k$  (by computing  $f_{x_{k+1}, \dots, n}(z)$  by itself).

By Proposition 9

$$D^{O_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv \tilde{D}_k^{\tilde{O}_k(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \equiv \tilde{D}_k^{\pi_{k,n}}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_k}(1^n) \quad (2)$$

## Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n)$$

It holds that

$$D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{O_{k-1}(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \quad (3)$$

## Actual proof

$$D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n)$$

It holds that

$$D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{O_{k-1}(U_{2n}^t)}(1^n) \quad (3)$$

Hence, by Equation (2)

$$D^{O_k(g(U_n)^t)}(1^n) \equiv D^{H_{k-1}}(1^n)$$

## Section 3

# PRP from PRF

## Pseudorandom permutations

Let  $\tilde{\Pi}_n$  be the set of all permutations over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ .

### Definition 10 (pseudorandom permutations)

A permutation ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$  is a pseudorandom permutation, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\tilde{\Pi}_n}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n), \quad (4)$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$

## Pseudorandom permutations

Let  $\tilde{\Pi}_n$  be the set of all permutations over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ .

### Definition 10 (pseudorandom permutations)

A permutation ensemble  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$  is a pseudorandom permutation, if

$$\left| \Pr[D^{\mathbb{F}_n}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\tilde{\Pi}_n}(1^n) = 1] \right| = \text{neg}(n), \quad (4)$$

for any oracle-aided PPT  $D$

- Equation (4) holds for any PRF



## Construction

### Construction 11

Given a function family  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$ , let  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}) = \{\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n): \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}\}$ , where  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n) = \{\text{LR}(f): f \in \mathbb{F}_n\}$  and  $\text{LR}(f)(\ell, r) = (r, f(r) \oplus \ell)$ .

## Construction

### Construction 11

Given a function family  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$ , let  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}) = \{\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n): \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}\}$ , where  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n) = \{\text{LR}(f): f \in \mathbb{F}_n\}$  and  $\text{LR}(f)(\ell, r) = (r, f(r) \oplus \ell)$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\text{LR}^i(\mathbb{F})$  be the  $i$ 'th iteration of  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$ .

## Construction

### Construction 11

Given a function family  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$ , let  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}) = \{\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n): \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}\}$ , where  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n) = \{\text{LR}(f): f \in \mathbb{F}_n\}$  and  $\text{LR}(f)(\ell, r) = (r, f(r) \oplus \ell)$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\text{LR}^i(\mathbb{F})$  be the  $i$ 'th iteration of  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$ .

$\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$  is always a permutation family, and is efficient if  $\mathbb{F}$  is.

## Construction

### Construction 11

Given a function family  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$ , let  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}) = \{\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n): \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}\}$ , where  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n) = \{\text{LR}(f): f \in \mathbb{F}_n\}$  and  $\text{LR}(f)(\ell, r) = (r, f(r) \oplus \ell)$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\text{LR}^i(\mathbb{F})$  be the  $i$ 'th iteration of  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$ .

$\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$  is always a permutation family, and is efficient if  $\mathbb{F}$  is.

### Theorem 12 (Luby-Rackoff)

*Assuming that  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF, then  $\text{LR}^3(\mathbb{F})$  is a PRP*

## Construction

### Construction 11

Given a function family  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathbb{F}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$ , let  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}) = \{\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n): \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{2n}\}$ , where  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F}_n) = \{\text{LR}(f): f \in \mathbb{F}_n\}$  and  $\text{LR}(f)(\ell, r) = (r, f(r) \oplus \ell)$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\text{LR}^i(\mathbb{F})$  be the  $i$ 'th iteration of  $\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$ .

$\text{LR}(\mathbb{F})$  is always a permutation family, and is efficient if  $\mathbb{F}$  is.

### Theorem 12 (Luby-Rackoff)

*Assuming that  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF, then  $\text{LR}^3(\mathbb{F})$  is a PRP*

It suffices to prove the the following holds for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  (why?)

### Claim 13

$|\Pr[D^{\text{LR}^3(\Pi_n)}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr[D^{\tilde{\Pi}_{2n}}(1^n) = 1]| \leq \frac{4 \cdot q^2}{2^n},$   
for any  $q$ -query algorithm  $D$ .

## Section 4

# Applications

## general paradigm

Design a scheme assuming that you have random functions,  
and the realize them using PRF.

# Private-key Encryption

## Construction 14 (PRF-based encryption)

Given an (efficient) PRF  $\mathbb{F}$ , define the encryption scheme (Gen, Enc, Dec) se:

**Key generation** Gen( $1^n$ ) returns  $k \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_n$

**Encryption** Enc $_k(m)$  returns  $U_n, k(U_n) \oplus m$

**Decryption** Dec $_k(c = (c_1, c_n))$  returns  $k(c_1) \oplus c_2$



## Private-key Encryption

### Construction 14 (PRF-based encryption)

Given an (efficient) PRF  $\mathbb{F}$ , define the encryption scheme (Gen, Enc, Dec) se:

**Key generation** Gen( $1^n$ ) returns  $k \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_n$

**Encryption** Enc $_k(m)$  returns  $U_n, k(U_n) \oplus m$

**Decryption** Dec $_k(c = (c_1, c_n))$  returns  $k(c_1) \oplus c_2$

- Advantages over the PRG based scheme?

# Private-key Encryption

## Construction 14 (PRF-based encryption)

Given an (efficient) PRF  $\mathbb{F}$ , define the encryption scheme (Gen, Enc, Dec) se:

**Key generation** Gen( $1^n$ ) returns  $k \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_n$

**Encryption** Enc $_k(m)$  returns  $U_n, k(U_n) \oplus m$

**Decryption** Dec $_k(c = (c_1, c_n))$  returns  $k(c_1) \oplus c_2$

- Advantages over the PRG based scheme?
- Proof of security

Message Authentication Code (MAC)

## Message Authentication Code (MAC)

Goal: message authentication.

## Message Authentication Code (MAC)

Goal: message authentication.

### Definition 15 (MAC)

A MAC is a tuple of PPT's  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  such that

- 1  $\text{Gen}(1^n)$  outputs a key  $k \in \{0, 1\}^*$
- 2  $\text{Mac}(k, m)$  outputs a "tag"  $t$
- 3  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t)$  output 1 (YES) or 0 (NO)

## Message Authentication Code (MAC)

Goal: message authentication.

### Definition 15 (MAC)

A MAC is a tuple of PPT's  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  such that

- 1  $\text{Gen}(1^n)$  outputs a key  $k \in \{0, 1\}^*$
- 2  $\text{Mac}(k, m)$  outputs a "tag"  $t$
- 3  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t)$  output 1 (YES) or 0 (NO)

We require

**Consistency:**  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t) = 1$  for any  $k \in \text{Supp}(\text{Gen}(1^n))$ ,  
 $m \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $t = \text{Mac}(k, m)$

**Unforgability:** No PPT wins the MAC game with respect to  
 $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$

**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

- “Private key” definition

**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

- “Private key” definition
- Variable length messages?



**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

- “Private key” definition
- Variable length messages?
- Definition too strong? Any message? Use of Verifier?

**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

- “Private key” definition
- Variable length messages?
- Definition too strong? Any message? Use of Verifier?
- “Reply attacks”

**Definition 16 (MAC game)**

Let  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$  be a MAC and let  $K_n = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ . An oracle-aided algorithm  $A$  wins the MAC game with respect to  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Mac}, \text{Vrfy})$ , if the following is not negligible:

$$(m, t) \leftarrow A^{\text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot), \text{Vrfy}(K_n, \cdot, \cdot)}(1^n) \wedge \text{Vrfy}(K_n, m, t) = 1 \\ \wedge \text{Mac}(K_n, \cdot) \text{ was not asked on } m$$

- “Private key” definition
- Variable length messages?
- Definition too strong? Any message? Use of Verifier?
- “Reply attacks”

**Definition 17 ( $\ell$ -time MAC)**

Same as in Definition 15, but security is only required against  $\ell$ -query adversaries.

Message Authentication Code (MAC)

## constructions

### Construction 18 (One-time MAC)

$\text{Gen}(1^n) = U_n$ ,  $\text{Mac}(k, m) = k \oplus m$  and  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t) = 1$  iff  $t = k \oplus m$

Message Authentication Code (MAC)

## constructions

### Construction 18 (One-time MAC)

$\text{Gen}(1^n) = U_n$ ,  $\text{Mac}(k, m) = k \oplus m$  and  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t) = 1$  iff  $t = k \oplus m$

### Construction 19 ( $\ell \in \text{poly-time MAC}$ , Stateful)

Use  $\ell$  random strings of length  $n$

## constructions

### Construction 18 (One-time MAC)

$\text{Gen}(1^n) = U_n$ ,  $\text{Mac}(k, m) = k \oplus m$  and  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t) = 1$  iff  $t = k \oplus m$

### Construction 19 ( $\ell \in \text{poly-time MAC}$ , Stateful)

Use  $\ell$  random strings of length  $n$

### Construction 20 ( $\ell \in \text{poly-time MAC}$ )

$\text{Gen}(1^n)$  return a random member in  $\mathcal{H}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{H}_n: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$  is an efficient family of  $\ell$ -wise independent hash functions.<sup>a</sup>

Let  $\text{Mac}(k, m) = k(m)$ , and  $\text{Vrfy}(k, m, t) = 1$  iff  $t = k(m)$ .

---

<sup>a</sup>For any distinct  $x_1, \dots, x_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $\text{Pr}_h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}_n[h(x_1) = y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge h(x_\ell) = y_\ell] = 2^{-\ell n}$ .

## PRF-based MAC

### Construction 21 (PRF-based MAC)

Same as Construction 20, but uses a family of length preserving function  $\mathbb{F}$  instead of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### Claim 22

Assuming that  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF, then Construction 21 is a (poly-time) MAC.

Proof:

## PRF-based MAC

### Construction 21 (PRF-based MAC)

Same as Construction 20, but uses a family of length preserving function  $\mathbb{F}$  instead of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### Claim 22

Assuming that  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF, then Construction 21 is a (poly-time) MAC.

Proof: Easy to prove if  $\mathbb{F}$  is a family of random functions. Hence, also holds in case  $\mathbb{F}$  is a PRF.  $\square$